and withdrew from the synod. On 27 September Müller was elected Reich Bishop by the National Synod, and proceeded to fill the central administration with other German Christians, such as Bishop Schöffel of Hamburg, and Pastor Lossenfelder of Elberfeld, leader of the German Christians and Vice President of the Pressian Supreme Church Council.[1]

The new administration proceeded as rapidly as possible to use its powers for the accomplishment of the Nazi Church program. Various measures were taken to impair the freedom of the clergy, and to secure the dissolution of religious associations. (For specific details, see Section V below.) In his attempt to integrate the various Landeskirchen, Müller was aided by Dr. Jäger, formerly State Commissioner for Church Affairs in Prussia, who in April 1934 was taken into the Spiritual Council as legal member and head of the Church Chancery. On 9 August 1934 Müller summoned a National Synod packed with Nazis to Berlin. It transferred all its powers to Müller and prescribed a form of oath for all pastors and church officials.[2]

In spite of the formidable legal powers vested in the Reich Bishop, the attempt to control the Evangelical Church by these means failed. The Churches of Hannover, Württemberg and Bavaria, under the leadership of their respective bishops

1. Ibid, p. 418.
2. Gerd Rühle, Das Dritte Reich (1934) Hummerlverlag, Berlin, p. 383.

Marahrens, Wurm and Meiser refused to yield to pressure, and were supported by a vast majority of their pastors. When Wurm and Meiser were placed under house arrest, public demonstrations occurred in their support.[1] On 28 October 1934 a civil court declared all of Jäger's acts in Bavaria to have been illegal.[2] Opposition finally crystallized in the so-called Confessional Church, made up of the Churches of Bavaria and Württemberg and representatives of protesting Evangelical clergymen in other parts of Germany. On 29-31 May 1934 and 20 October 1934 the first and second Confessional Synods of the Evangelical Church of Germany were held at Barmen and at Dahlem respectively,[3] and succeeded in uniting a large part of the German Evangelical Church in protest against the doctrines and Church policies of the Reich Bishop. Obviously the attempt to make the Church a united agency for the accomplishment of Nazi purposes had failed. Thus Reich Bishop Müller, although never being forced officially to resign his position, was gradually superseded by other agencies of Nazi control, and faded from the scene.

b. The Period of Direct Administration. Around the middle of 1935, a new attempt was made to establish unity within the German Evangelical Church, this time by the use of Government authority rather than through the agency of the German Christians operating within the Church Government. To

1. Reported in the foreign press. Evidence should now be available from the bishops themselves, or from members of their dioceses.
2. Citation unavailable here.
3. Reports of these events were kept out of the press. Details should now be available from Niemöller and other Confessional leaders.

this end the powers of the government in Church affairs were strengthened. On 26 June 1935 a Law on the Settlement of Legal Questions Arising in the Evangelical Church[1] deprived the Evangelical churches of their right to sue before the regular courts, and set up a special administrative court (Beschlussstelle) with the power of final decision in such matters. This deprived the Churches of the rights of self-administration and protection in the civil courts to which as corporations of public law they were entitled under Article 137 of the Weimar Constitution. On 16 July 1935 Hitler announced the creation of the post of a Reich Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs.[2] One of the first acts of the new minister, Dr. Hanns Kerrl, was to transfer the Beschlussstelle from the Ministry of Interior to his own jurisdiction. On 27 July 1935 he made himself president of this special court. On 24 September 1935 the organization of the ministry was further developed by a Law for the Safeguarding of the German Evangelical Church[3] by which "The Reich Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs is empowered, for the restoration of orderly conditions in the German Evangelical Church and the Regional Evangelical Churches, to issue ordinances with binding legal force." On 20 March 1937 the Minister for Church Affairs delegated the administration of the Church to Dr. Werner, president of the Church Chancery of the German Evangelical Church.[4] On 10 December 1937 the

1. RGBl.,I (1935) p. 774.
2. Rühle, Das Dritte Reich (1935) p. 301.
3. RGBl.,I (1935) p. 1178.
4. RGBl.,I (1937) p. 333.

appointment was made permanent, and he was authorized to promulgate ordinances on all church matters except questions of faith and worship.[1] Thus the exercise of control over the entire Church administration was placed in the hands of government appointees. In this way formal legal validity was given to all subsequent acts directed against the German Evangelical Churches.

The principal victims of the ensuing persecution were members of the Confessional Church. At first an attempt was made to conciliate them by the appointment on 14 October 1935 of church committees, on which friends of the Confessional Synod were represented, for the government and administration of the Churches.[2] Although some of the protesting Landeskirchen were thereby reconciled, many of the Confessionals refused to accept the authority of these committees. This was met with a series of repressive measures against the Confessional Church. On 2 December 1935 the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs declared their central organs (Provisional Church Government, and the Council of Brethren of the Confessional Synod) illegal.[3] On 2 December 1935 the authority of the Church Ministry was expressly denied by Dr. Niemöller, leader of the Confessionals.

In May 1936 the leaders of the Confessional Church addressed a memorandum to Hitler denouncing the anti-Christian

1. RGBl., I (1937) p. 1346.
2. Rühle, Das Dritte Reich (1935) p. 304. Authority for the appointment of these committees was given in the ordinance of 3 October 1935 (RGBl., I, p. 1221.)
3. Ibid., p. 306. Authority for this action was given in an ordinance of the same date (RGBl., I (1935) p. 1370).

acts of the government.[1] When this was met with further acts of repression, the failure of the church committees to effect a reconciliation was admitted by Ecclesiastical Minister Kerrl, in a report to Hitler. From that time onward the official attitude was that the Confessional Church was illegal, and its activities were persecuted to the point where they became almost completely ineffective. For specific instances of this persecution, see the following section.

3. The Christian Sects. Certain of the smaller Christian sects, especially the Jehovah's Witnesses (Ernste Bibelforscher) and the Pentecostal Association (Freie Christengemeinde) were particularly objectionable from the Nazi standpoint because of their advanced pacifist views. Since they were without important influence at home or abroad, it was possible to proceed against them more drastically than against the larger Christian Churches. Both groups were therefore declared illegal[2] and there were times when almost no adherent of either group was outside a concentration camp.[3] For specific instances of this persecution see below, p. 32-33).

1. Not reported in the current German press. Evidence should be obtainable from Niemöller and other Confessional leaders.
2. This was done not on a national but on a local basis. Thus the dissolution in Hesse was accomplished by an ordinance of 18 October 1933 issued by the Hesseschen Staatsministeriums and published in the official Darmstadter Zeitung. (See J.W. (1934) p. 1747).
3. See Micklem, op.cit.,p. 51, and Franz Zuercher, Kreuzzug gegen das Christentum (Zürich, 1938, Europa-Verlag).

B. Policies Adopted in the Incorporated Areas

In areas like Alsace-Lorraine or western Poland, and to some extent in Austria, where the Nazis were attempting to incorporate a substantial non-German population into the body of the Reich, local church organizations were feared primarily as potential centers of national resistance to German domination. The policies adopted against the Churches in these regions were therefore particularly severe, the most seriously afflicted being western Poland. A summary statement of the measures taken in these regions, together with a vigorous protest against them, is to be found in the memorial of 15 December 1942 addressed to the German Minister for Church Affairs, the German Minister for the Interior and the Chief of the Chancery by the German Catholic bishops assembled at Fulda.[1] For specific details see Section V below.

C. Policies Adopted in other Occupied Areas

In other occupied areas, which were designed to support but not to take a leading part in the Nazi campaign of world conquest, the need to impose a unified Nazi philosophy was less great than in other regions. Thus there was no general motive for persecution in these areas. In regions, like Slovakia, where the Churches proved generally cooperative with the occupying authorities, they were officially favored.

1. Not available here. Should be obtainable in the offices of German dioceses.

But in countries where the spirit of national resistance was widely supported by the local churches, the Nazis felt no compunction about persecuting them vigorously. The countries to suffer most in this respect were the General Government of Poland and occupied Norway. For specific instances of persecution in these areas see below, Section V.

V. METHODS USED TO IMPLEMENT THE POLICY OF PERSECUTION

In order to implement their general policy of persecution, the National Socialists interfered at every possible stage in the activities of the Christian Churches. Sometimes they accomplished their purposes by direct intervention of the Reich or Land governments under their control or, in the case of Norway and other occupied but unincorporated areas, by intervention of a native puppet government. At other times they preferred to accomplish their purposes through the use of the SA, the Hitler Youth and other Party organizations. The principal forms of intervention were the following.

A. Interference With The Central Institutions Of Church Government

The easiest way to achieve rapid results in the destruction of the Christian Churches was to paralyze their central institutions, and thus deprive them of the advantages of central leadership. This was accomplished either by the direct seizure and exploitation of those institutions by Nazi or pro-Nazi personnel, or by interference with the effective operation of those institutions which could not be thus subjected to seizure and exploitation.

1. The Direct Seizure Of Central Institutions Of Church Government. This could be most easily accomplished in the case of Christian Churches which had a long tradition of dependence upon state authority. This aspect of the persecution was generally carried out through the forms of law, without the necessity for any important admixture of illegal action. The most important cases of this sort were the following:

a. The Seizure Of The German Evangelical Church. The steps whereby legal control over the central governing institutions of the German Evangelical Church was established, first on behalf of German Christian supporters of the Nazi government, later on behalf of the Nazi government itself, are outlined above pp. 19-26)

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. The major steps in this process are a matter of legal record. The principal laws and ordinances by which the seizure was accomplished are cited above.

b. The Seizure Of The Norwegian National Church. The Evangelical Lutheran State Church, to which 98.6% of the population adhered, was a state church established by royal decree. C hurch affairs were handled by the Department of Church and Education. When the Germans invaded the country and set up a Reichskomissar for the occupied Norwegian territories,[1] they gained control over this central organi-

1. Deutsche Verordnungsblatt für Norwegen, April 20 - May 6, p. 2.

zation. Pro-Nazi Norwegians were placed in charge of the Department of Church and Education, subsequently replaced by the Ministry for Culture and Enlightenment. These powers were exercised in such a way that the entire Norwegian pastorate, with insignificant exceptions, decided on Easter Sunday, 1942, to make joint resignation of their public offices and salaries,[1] thus proclaiming their conviction that the central institutions of the state church were no longer available for the accomplishment of Christian purposes.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Although native Norwegian collaborators played the principal role in the persecution of the Norwegian church, it is a matter of legal record that final control over and hence final responsibility for their actions rests with the German Reichskomissariat for Norway. All necessary evidence with regard to the course of the church conflict in Norway can no doubt be obtained from Norwegian church authorities.

2. Interference with the Normal Operation of Central Institutions of Church Government. In the case of the Catholic and of some Protestant Churches, the Nazis were unable to gain control of the central institutions of Church

1. Neue Zuricher Zeitung 4/1/42.

government. In these cases they tried as far as possible to prevent those central institutions from operating. The methods used were more or less drastic, depending on the circumstances.

a. Legal Abolition Of Central Institutions Of Church Government. In accord with the generally cautious policies adopted by the Nazis in their campaign for the persecution of the Christian Churches, this device was sparingly used. The principal cases are the following.

i. Prohibition Of Certain German Sects. Under the Nazi regime the organization and activities of the Ernste Bibelforscher and Freie Christengemeinde were declared illegal. They were rigorously suppressed by the police.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. For general references, see above, p. 26). The dissolution of the Jehovah's Witnesses was declared in violation of Article 1937 of the Weimar Constitution in a case decided on 26 March 1934 by the Special Court of Darmstadt (Juristische Wochenschrift (hereafter abbr. J. W.) 1934, p. 1747). Most courts, however, upheld the decision of the government. For cases illustrating some of the ways in which members of this sect were persecuted, the following court decisions should be consulted:

(1) Refusal of a peddler's license. Bayerischer Verwaltungsgerichtshof, 8 May 1936 (Reger, Vol. 37, p. 535); (2) Refusal of a permit to practice as a midwife. Sächsisches Oberverwaltungsgericht, 4 December 1936 (J.W. 1937, p. 1368); (3) Dismissal of a postal clerk. Reichsdienststrafhof, 11 February 1935 (Zeitschrift für Beamtenrscht 1936, p. 104); Refusal of the right to conduct family worship in the home. Reichsgericht, 17 February 1938 (J.W. 1938, p. 1018); Removal of children from the custody of their parents. Landgericht Hamburg, 6 May 1936 (Jgdrecht u. Jgdwohlfahrt 1936, p. 281).

ii. Prohibition of the Central Governing Organs of the German Confessionals. On December 20, 1935 the Provisional Church Government and the Council of Brethren of the Confessional Synod were specifically declared illegal by the Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs. Although the repressive measures actually taken were not sufficient to prevent these groups from acting, this ruling prevented them from enjoying the privileges of public law corporations, to which the Evangelical Church was entitled under existing German law.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. See above, p. 25-26)

b. The Imposition Of Financial Controls Upon The Operation Of Church Governments. The principal Christian Churches of Germany had long derived their main financial support from state collected church taxes. To maintain effective control over these organizations it was therefore sufficient to deprive them of all other sources of revenue, and to impose state restrictions upon the expenditure of state collected funds. The Sammlungsgesetz of 5 November 1934[1] which placed severe restrictions on the right of churches and other organizations to solicit contributions was an important hindrance to the financial independence of all churches.

i. Financial Control Of The German Evangelical Church. The establishment of machinery for financial control played a major part in the Nazi capture of the German Evangelical Church organization. Under earlier German law local church authorities had exercised considerable authority in determining the rate of and allocating the revenues from church taxes. On 11 March 1935 the Prussian government deprived the Prussian church of this power by setting

1. RGBl., I, (1934) p. 1086

up state controlled finance departments for the management of the finances of all Evangelical churches in Prussia. By ordinance of 25 June 1937[1] state controlled finance departments were set up for the German Evangelical Church and for each of the Provincial Churches, with the right to regulate the conditions of service of all officials of the general church administrations, of the pastors and of the local parish officials and employees. By an ordinance of 9 June 1937 it was provided that all church collections had to be subject to the approval of the central church authorities.[2] Since the control of the central authorities of the German Evangelical Church was in Nazi hands this meant that all Protestant congregations, including those Confessional congregations which had been maintained by voluntary contributions, could be deprived of all financial support at the discretion of the Nazi authorities.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. The legislation by which this control was exercised is a matter of record. For a specific instance of the way in which the resulting power was exercised, see below, Case 1.[3]

1. RGBl., I, (1937) p. 697.
2. Citation unavailable here.
3. Citation unavailable here.

CASE 1. THE FINANCIAL COERCION OF THE DAHLEM PARISH. The Dahlem parish of the German Evangelical Church, being located in a fashionable part of Berlin, was comparatively prosperous. It enjoyed an income of around 400,000 marks, half of which exceeded its immediate needs. When its pastor, Dr. Niemöller, leader of the Confessionals, was dismissed from his pastorate by the Reich Bishop Müller on 1 March 1935, the congregational assembly refused to obey the order, and asked him to continue to serve. They refused to transfer their income to the central church offices, and devoted about half of it to the Confessional Church. The transfer was finally enforced, however, by a commissioner appointed by the finance department.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Evidence should be obtainable from Dr. Niemöller, and from other serving members of the parish.

c. Interruption of Official Communications within the Church Government. The effective operation of any large organization depends on the maintenance of free and confidential communication between officials. This right was guaranteed for the Catholic Church in Germany by Article IV of the Concordat, which reads "In its relations and correspondence with the bishops, clergy and other members of the Catholic Church in Germany, the Holy See enjoys full freedom. The same applies to the bishops and other diocesan

officials in their dealings with the faithful in all matters belonging to their pastoral office." Violations of this right played an important part in the total Nazi scheme for the persecution of the Christian Churches. As early as 1935 the bishops were made to realize that their correspondence and telephone calls were subject to constant surveillance by the police.[1]

The following cases might repay investigation.

1. Cases in Germany Proper.

CASE 2. In February, 1937 Dr. Zöllner, the Chairman of the Reich Church Committee, was prevented by the police from visiting nine Confessional Pastors of Lübeck who had been arrested by the secret police. This interference with his attempted conciliation led to the resignation of Zöllner and his committee on 14 February 1937.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Evidence should be obtainable from serving Confessional leaders.

CASE 3. When the bishop of Wuerzburg, Mgr. Ehrenfried, travelled to Rome in November 1938, he was held up on the German frontier and had to stand by while all his luggage and documents were searched. Photostats were made of everything written in Latin.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 3 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 42. Since Mgr. Ehrenfried is alive and still bishop of Wuerzburg it would be easy to have himself as a witness.

1. See: The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, p. 42.

CASE 4. In 1936 the offices of the Diocesan Administration of Freiburg im Breisgau were raided by the Gestapo.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 4 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, p.41. Archbishop Groeber and every member of the Diocesan Administration of Freiburg who held his position prior to the reported incident might be witnesses.

CASE 5. In 1937 fifty officials of the Gestapo searched the offices of the Administration of the Archdiocese of Cologne.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 5 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 41. Every member of the diocesan administration who held his position prior to the reported incident is a potential witness.

CASE 6. In 1937 the offices of the Vicar General in Aachen were searched.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 6 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 42. Every member of the diocesan administration who held his position prior to the reported incident is a potential witness.

CASE 7. On 31 August 1938 Cardinal Faulhaber's offices in Munich were searched.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 7 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich. page 42. Cardinal Faulhaber and every member of the diocesan administration who held his position prior to the reported incident might be a witness.

CASE 8. On 15 April 1939 the offices of the Bishop of Limburg on the Lahn were searched. The archives of certain ecclesiastical foundations were confiscated and carried away, together with the money belonging to them.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 8 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 42. Mgr. Hilfrich, bishop of Limburg and every member of the diocesan administration who held his position prior to the reported incident might be a witness.

CASE 9. In the Diocesan Administration buildings in Berlin the German bishops had set up an Information Bureau under the direction of Mgr. Banasch. This office was raided in December 1935. All papers were examined, and Mgr. Banasch was arrested and held in jail until March 1936.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 9 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich. Count v. Preysing, Bishop of Berlin, Mgr. Banasch himself and every member of the diocesan administration who held his position prior to the reported incident could be witnesses.

ii. Cases in the Incorporated Areas

CASE 10. In 1938 a search was carried out in the ordinariates of Vienna, Salzburg and Seckau.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 10 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich page 42.

Cardinal Innitzer, Bishop Pavlikowski and every member of the three diocesan administrations who held his position prior to the reported incidents might be witnesses.

B. Interference with the Persons of the Clergy and of Lay Workers

Insofar as it was not possible or prudent to control the Churches through their central administrative aparatus, it was possible to cripple their work by intimidating or eliminating those clergymen or lay workers who were attempting to carry out church policies. So far as the Catholic Church is concerned, the rights of the clergy to special protection were guaranteed in Article V of the Concordat, which read "In the exercise of their spiritual activities the clergy shall enjoy the protection of the State in the same way as State officials. The state will take proceedings in accordance with the general provisions of State law against any outrage offered to the clergy personally or directed against their ecclesiastical character, or any interference with the duties of their office, and in case of need will provide official protection." In spite of this, interferences with the personal security of the clergy, both Protestant and Catholic, and of leading lay workers of the Churches was very freely used as a means of hampering the activities of the Christian Churches. This was accomplished by the following means:

1. The Murder of Church Leaders. In line with their generally cautious policies of Church persecution, the Nazis were somewhat sparing in the use of these means. The official Nazi policy was expressed by Robert Wagner, Gauleiter of Baden, when he said "The Catholic church need not imagine that we are going to create martyrs. We shall not give the church that satisfaction -- she shall have, not martyrs, but criminals."[1] Even within the borders of Germany proper, however, there were some instances of the murder of Church personalities, and in the incorporated areas, where the reactions of public opinion were less to be feared, the numbers of such cases were quite substantial.

a. Cases in Germany Proper. The cases in this category most worthy of investigation are the deaths of the Catholic leaders Klausener, Beck and Probst. They are considered in detail on pages 8-10 of the report on "Criminal Responsibilities in Connection with the Purge of 1934", R&A No. 3113.1.

b. Cases in the Incorporated Areas. The murder of large numbers of Catholic priests is reported by the Polish Ministry of Information in London as having occurred in the incorporated regions of western Poland.[2] Since no sufficient

1. In a speech delivered at Loerrelch (Baden) in the fall of 1935, as quoted in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich.
2. See: The Nazi Kultur in Poland, London, 1945, p. 9-11.

details are given, it would be necessary to get in touch with the informed Polish authorities in order to prepare specific cases. The possibility that patriotic Polish priests may actually have been engaged in acts against the occupying authorities will somewhat complicate the problem of proving persecution in these instances.

c. Cases in the Occupied Areas. The murder of numbers of Catholic priests is reported by the Polish Ministry of Information in London as having occurred in the incorporated regions of western Poland.[1] The problem of proof is the same as in section ii above.

2. The Assaulting of Church Leaders. In order to hamper the church leaders in carrying out their work, they were frequently subjected to actual or threatened personal violence. The SA, the SS, the Hitler Youth and other Party organizations were most frequently used in carrying out this aspect of the persecution.

a. Cases in German Proper.

CASE 11. Bishop Dr. Sproll of Rottenburg, absent from his diocese because of the disturbances caused by his having failed to vote in the elections of 10 April 1938, returned to his residence on 15 July 1938 on instructions from the Holy See. The next day demonstrations started in which about 100 young people, members of the Hitler Youth, took part. Few

1. See: Polish Information Service, "The Nazi Kultur in Poland," London, 1945, p. 19-20.

of them were from Rottenburg itself. The demonstrators forced an entrance into the Bishop's residence through the chancellery. A group of them came shouting and yelling into the Bishop's private chapel, where he knelt before the exposed Blessed Sacrament. They hesitated and withdrew, making contemptuous remarks. So did another party when they saw the Bishop in prayer. Finally, the editor of the Flammenzeichen of Stuttgart, with five other men, appeared and tried in vain to persuade the Bishop to leave the town. Mean while, the rest of the intruders ransacked the offices and private belongings of the Bishop. Finally the mob marched off, singing the Horst Wessel Song and "Deutschland ueber Alles". Next day a representative of the Gestapo visited the Bishop and told him to leave Rottenburg, threatening that otherwise the demonstrations would be repeated. The Bishop replied: "I have strict orders from the Holy See to return to my diocese. I am the Bishop of Rottenburg, and I shall remain in Rottenburg, even if I lose my life in doing so."

On 18 July another demonstration occurred. This time the demonstrators numbered between 1,500 and 2,000 and again the majority are believed to have come from other places.

The bishop's residence was stoned. In the bishop's study alone four large rocks were found.

A third demonstration occurred on 23 July. The demonstrators had been brought to Rottenburg in cars and buses from as much as 30 Miles away. Again the crowd forced its way into the building. In the bishop's private chapel they found the Archbishop of Freiburg, who had arrived in Rottenburg, the Vicar-General and some of the Cathedral canons. They insulted the Archbishop and showed their contempt for the exposed Sacrament by smoking and keeping their hats on. The Bishop was then expelled from his diocese by order of the Ministry of Interior of Rottenburg and left for Freiburg.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Evidence as to the planned nature of these demonstrations is contained in a letter received by Bishop Sproll a few days after the incident, and published subsequently in a Swiss paper.[1] This letter declares: "I was one of those present last Saturday -- not indeed of my own free will, but by order. I have always been proud of my country, but last Saturday I was, for the first time, ashamed to call myself a German. And a number of the comrades of my section think the same way as I do. We were ashamed of ourselves for having -- without our knowledge -- allowed ourselves to be used for such a scandalous affair....By staging this

1. Ostschweiz, 13 October 1938.

demonstration the Party had given us an involuntary proof that you acted rightly on 10 April. The mere fact that the SA had to attend in civilian dress indicated that the Party itself had the feeling that what was happening was not the proper thing for the 'dress of honor' of the SA."

Soon after the departure of the bishop, the Nazi area leader, Dr. Fritsch, declared before a thousand political leaders of the Freiburg district in the Festhalle that "The Archbishop should be thankful that he was still able to reside in his house and had not already received the proper answer to his goings on. This ragamuffin was spreading lying statements in the foreign press, and that was high treason. Here, publicly, I call him a knave, a liar and a traitor to his country."[1]

The "Sproll-incidents" were described in an official ecclesiastical announcement which was read in several German dioceses on the last Sunday of July, 1938. Concerning the last demonstration of July 23rd, Der Deutsche In Polen (Katovice) printed on August 14th, 1938, a copy of the authentic information sent by the diocesan authorities to the Reichminister for Ecclesiastical Affairs.

1. Printed in the Schaffhausener Zietung, Schaffhausen, Switzerland, September 13th, 1938.

Bishop Sproll, Archbishop Groeber, the members of Bishop Sproll's household and the members of his diocesan administration who held office prior to the reported incidents could be witnesses.

CASE 12. On 12 May 1935 the late Archbishop Klein of Paderborn paid a visit to Hamm. On his arrival he was mobbed by the Hitler Youth, members of which tried to overturn his car, spat at him, and attacked with their "daggers of honor" some Catholics who tried to protect him. The address of welcome to the bishop at the St. Agnes-Kirchplatz had to be abandoned. The Nazi manifestation had obviously been carefully prepared. Hitler Youth leaders from Dortmund and Hamm took part in it.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. The members of the Catholic clergy of Hamm who were residing in that community at the time of the reported incident could be witnesses. Case 12 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 252.

CASE 13. On 26 May 1934 the Bishop of Trier, Mgr. Bornewasser, was insulted by Hitler Youth at the end of the Confirmation service in Kreuznach.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 13 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 253. Bishop Bornewasser himself could be a witness.

CASE 14. At the beginning of 1935 the murder of Cardinal Faulhaber was demanded in public meetings in Munich. Examples: a meeting of 15 February of the German School Union, at which the Nazi City School Inspector Bauer spoke; a meeting on 17 May of the German Faith Movement; a meeting on 13 June 1935 at which a Dr. Engel of the Ludendorff movement was the speaker.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Case 14 is reported in The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 252. Members of the Diocesan Administration of Munich could be witnesses.

CASE 15. In june 1937 the Bishop of Trier, Mgr. Bornewasser, was attacked bodily in the Hunsrueck area.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. See, The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 253. Bishop Bornewasser himself could be a witness.

CASE 16. At the end of November 1938, after a speech by a Gauleiter and State Minister Wagner in Munich, uniformed detachments in motor-cars and on motor cycles arrived in front of the Cardinal's residence. A hail of stones was directed against the windows, while the men shouted "Take the rotten traitor to Dachau". Armed with crowbars, the demonstrators shattered the window frames and shutters.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Eye-witness report published in Der Deutsche in Polen of 27 November 1938. Cardinal Faulhaber himself could be a witness.

CASE 17. On 21 September 1935 the walls of ecclesiastical buildings in Freiburg Breisgau were covered with inscriptions insulting the clergy.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. Official report of Vicar-General Rösch, 26 September 1935, No. 14091.

CASE 18. In May 1939 abusive demonstrations against Cardinal Faulhaber were renewed in several places in Bavaria, such as Gars, Wang and Muehldorf on the Inn, where at seven or eight points around the town posters were displayed saying "Away with Faulhaber, the friend of the Jews and the agent of Moscow."

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. See: The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 262 with Facsimile of the Muehldorf poster on the opposite page. Cardinal Faulhaber himself could be a witness.

CASE 19. On 25 October 1936 members of the Hitler Youth hurled insults at Cardinal Faulhaber as he was entering his car in Giesing, a suburb of Munich.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. See: The Persecution of the Catholic Church in the Third Reich, page 254. Cardinal Faulhaber himself could be a witness.

b. Cases in the Incorporated Areas.

CASE 20. On October 8, 1938 at eight fifteen in the evening demonstrations took place against the residence of Cardinal Archbishop Innitzer in Vienna. Stones were thrown, all windows broken, a heavy door broken. A quarter of an hour later the mob broke in, destroying everything they could find in the antechambers. Reaching the episcopal chapel, they struck a secretary of the Cardinal unconscious, and destroyed the statue of a saint and other property. The purple pectoral cross and ring of the Cardinal were stolen. The Archbishop's Master of Ceremonies was hit on the head with a candelabra. One of the priests was dragged to the window and only just saved from being thrown out. On the rumor that the police were coming they left, first demanding a signed statement from the inmates of the residence that they would never reveal these events. Not one of the intruders, who left singing "Deutschland über alles", was in any way interfered with in going out. The only person arrested was a correspondent of The Times.

THE PROBLEM OF PROOF. These events were reported in the Osservatore Romano of 15 October 1938. Eight days later, Gauleiter Buerckel of Vienna held a mass meeting on the Heldenplatz, in which he announced that an attempt by the clergy had been made to work the people up to a putsch against the Nazi government, and that therefore some stern measures